

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/063,004	FEIST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin M. Bernatz	1773	

All Participants:
Status of Application: allowed

 (1) Kevin M. Bernatz.

(3) _____.

 (2) Pam Curbelo.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 September 2006
Time: =

Type of Interview:


- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
all
Claims discussed:
all
Prior art documents discussed:
all
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated that amendment to the reduced thickness range, while capable of removing the Sandstrom reference as teaching away from the small thickness values, still was obvious in view of the prior art, such as Hirata et al., which taught high Tg polymeric substrates meeting the claimed thickness range. Upon discussion with applicants, the Examiner indicated that amendment to recite a range in the axial displacement would appear to bring the case into condition for allowance since Sandstrom was deemed the closest prior art to teach controlling the axial displacement.

Applicants indicated that there was some difficulty in directly comparing Sandstrom to the present invention due to difference in units and/or measurement technique used to determine the axial displacement. However, the Examiner noted that the comparative examples in the parent application of the present invention indicated that the claimed value of the axial displacement was not inherent to disk structures and required clear control of the various parameters to achieve. Given that Sandstrom taught achieving the reduced axial displacement by using thickness values exceeding the claimed range, the Examiner deemed that Sandstrom failed to teach or render obvious the combination of the reduced axial displacement value and the reduced thickness. Applicants agreed to submit a supplemental amendment incorporating the proposed changes.

In a follow-up interview, the Examiner indicated that a terminal disclaimer would be required versus U.S. Patent No. 7,087,290 (Fiest et al.) due to claiming substantially overlapping subject matter (e.g. a substrate comprising a plastic portion, wherein the plastic portion could comprise a polyarylene ether and a polystyrene). Applicants agreed to submit a terminal disclaimer to overcome the potential double patenting issues..